

*CRASSISPIRA* SWAINSON, 1840 (GASTROPODA, ORDER PROSOBRANCHIATA); PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE *PLEUROTOMA BOTTAE* VALENCIENNES, 1840, AS THE TYPE-SPECIES. Z.N.(S.) 459

By Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California*)

The genus *Crassispira* was proposed by Swainson (1840, *Treatise Malac.* : 151, 313), without any type designation, for two species, *Pleurotoma bottae* Auct. and *Crassispira fasciata* Swainson, 1840 (*Treatise Malac.* : 313). A type-species must be chosen from these two species.

2. The first subsequent designation of a type-species was made by Hermannsen in March 1847 (*Indicis Gen. Malacoz. Primordia* 1 : 318) who chose *Pleurotoma bottae* Valenciennes [in Kiener 1839–1840, *Spec. Gén. Icon. Coquilles Vivantes* 5:33]. The legality of this designation is open to question, since Swainson did not mention Valenciennes as a potential authority for *Pleurotoma bottae*. If the expression "Auct." is to be construed as including Valenciennes then this type designation is quite regular and legal, and it fixes the meaning of the generic name. But if it should not to be so construed the designation would be invalid.

3. Another type-species designation was made in November 1847 by Gray (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* 1847 (Pt. 15) : 134), who chose the other species, *Crassispira fasciata* Swainson. This designation would become effective if Hermannsen's designation should be declared void.

4. Grant and Gale in 1921 (*Mem. San Diego Soc. N.H.* 1 : 580) gave a convincing argument in favour of the hypothesis that *Pleurotoma bottae* Valenciennes is included in *Pleurotoma bottae* Auct. Woodring (1928, *Carnegie Inst. Wash.*, Publ. No. 385 : 147) gave an equally plausible argument that *Pleurotoma bottae* Valenciennes is not included in *Pleurotoma bottae* Auct. and that therefore Hermannsen's designation is illegal. Yet he accepts it because in the present state of practice any other course would be productive of confusion. In this opinion I concur.

5. There is added confusion deriving from the fact that Swainson's species cannot be identified from his illustration. Swainson himself placed it in the Columbellidae, which belongs to the tribe Rachiglossa, but his illustration suggests the Melaniidae in the Taenioglossa. The genus *Pleurotoma* is in the Turridae in the Toxioglossa.

6. If Gray's designation is held to be the correct one to use, then a new name must be found for the group traditionally called *Crassispira* and that name might have to be applied to a different group which is probably well known under some other name.

7. For these reasons I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all type-species selections for the genus *Crassispira* Swainson, 1840, made prior to this ruling, and having

done so, to designate *Pleurotoma bottae* Valenciennes in Kiener, 1839-40, as its type-species ;

- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the generic name *Crassispira* Swainson, 1840 (gender : feminine) type-species, by subsequent designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Pleurotoma bottae* Valenciennes in Kiener ;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *bottae* Valenciennes in Kiener, 1839-40, as published in the binomen *Pleurotoma bottae* (type-species of *Crassispira* Swainson, 1840).